

taxed was being broadened, does that mean that the Republican Party is now changing their opinion that that was a tax increase? Are they not taking it back?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is prepared to rule.

In deference to the specialized expertise that has been provided, the Chair rules that this bill does not include a Federal income tax rate increase.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, is the ruling discretionary? Mr. Speaker, is it a discretionary ruling?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully appeal the ruling of the Chair.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. ARCHER

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ARCHER moves to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 204, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 294]

AYES—228

Allard	Crane	Hancock
Archer	Crapo	Hansen
Army	Cremins	Hastert
Bachus	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Baker (CA)	Cunningham	Hayworth
Baker (LA)	Davis	Hefley
Ballenger	DeLay	Heineman
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Herger
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Hilleary
Bartlett	Doolittle	Hobson
Barton	Dornan	Hoekstra
Bass	Dreier	Hoke
Bateman	Duncan	Horn
Bereuter	Dunn	Hostettler
Bilbray	Ehlers	Houghton
Bilirakis	Ehrlich	Hunter
Bliley	Emerson	Hutchinson
Blute	English	Hyde
Boehlert	Ensign	Inglis
Boehner	Everett	Istook
Bonilla	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Bono	Fawell	Johnson, Sam
Brownback	Fields (TX)	Jones
Bryant (TN)	Flanagan	Kasich
Bunn	Foley	Kelly
Bunning	Forbes	Kim
Burr	Fowler	King
Burton	Fox	Kingston
Buyer	Franks (CT)	Klug
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Knollenberg
Calvert	Frisa	Kolbe
Camp	Funderburk	LaHood
Canady	Galleghy	Largent
Castle	Ganske	Latham
Chabot	Gekas	LaTourette
Chambliss	Gilchrest	Lazio
Chenoweth	Gillmor	Leach
Christensen	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Chrysler	Gingrich	Lewis (KY)
Clinger	Goodlatte	Lightfoot
Coble	Goodling	Linder
Coburn	Goss	Livingston
Collins (GA)	Graham	LoBiondo
Combest	Greenwood	Longley
Cooley	Gunderson	Lucas
Cox	Gutknecht	Manzullo

Martini	Quillen	Solomon
McCollum	Quinn	Spence
McCrery	Radanovich	Stearns
McDade	Ramstad	Stockman
McHugh	Regula	Stump
McInnis	Riggs	Talent
McIntosh	Roberts	Tate
McKeon	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
Metcalfe	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Mica	Roth	Tiahrt
Miller (FL)	Roukema	Torkildsen
Molinari	Royce	Upton
Moorhead	Salmon	Vucanovich
Morella	Sanford	Waldholtz
Myers	Saxton	Walker
Myrick	Scarborough	Walsh
Nethercutt	Schaefer	Wamp
Neumann	Schiff	Watts (OK)
Ney	Seastrand	Weldon (FL)
Norwood	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Nussle	Shadegg	Weller
Oxley	Shaw	White
Packard	Shays	Whitfield
Paxon	Shuster	Wicker
Petri	Skeen	Wolf
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
Porter	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)
Portman	Smith (TX)	Zeliff
Pryce	Smith (WA)	Zimmer

NOES—204

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Olver
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Ortiz
Andrews	Gordon	Orton
Baesler	Green	Owens
Baldacci	Gutierrez	Pallone
Barcia	Hall (OH)	Parker
Barrett (WI)	Hall (TX)	Pastor
Becerra	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Harman	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Berman	Hayes	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Bishop	Hilliard	Pickett
Bonior	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Borski	Holden	Poshard
Boucher	Hoyer	Rahall
Brewster	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Browder	Jacobs	Reed
Brown (CA)	Jefferson	Richardson
Brown (FL)	Johnson (SD)	Rivers
Brown (OH)	Johnson, E.B.	Roemer
Bryant (TX)	Johnston	Rose
Cardin	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Chapman	Kaptur	Rush
Clay	Kennedy (MA)	Sabo
Clayton	Kennedy (RI)	Sanders
Clement	Kennelly	Sawyer
Clyburn	Kildee	Schroeder
Coleman	Klecza	Schumer
Collins (IL)	Klink	Scott
Collins (MI)	LaFalce	Serrano
Condit	Lantos	Sisisky
Conyers	Laughlin	Skaggs
Costello	Levin	Skelton
Coyne	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Cramer	Lincoln	Spratt
Danner	Lipinski	Stark
de la Garza	Lofgren	Stenholm
Deal	Lowe	Stokes
DeFazio	Luther	Studds
DeLauro	Maloney	Stupak
Dellums	Manton	Tanner
Deutsch	Markey	Tauzin
Dicks	Martinez	Taylor (MS)
Dingell	Mascara	Tejeda
Dixon	Matsui	Thompson
Doggett	McCarthy	Thornton
Dooley	McDermott	Thurman
Doyle	McHale	Torres
Durbin	McKinney	Torrice
Edwards	McNulty	Towns
Engel	Meehan	Trafigant
Eshoo	Meek	Tucker
Evans	Menendez	Velazquez
Farr	Mfume	Vento
Fattah	Miller (CA)	Visclosky
Fazio	Mineta	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Minge	Ward
Flner	Mink	Waters
Flake	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Foglietta	Mollohan	Waxman
Ford	Montgomery	Williams
Frank (MA)	Moran	Wilson
Frost	Murtha	Wise
Furse	Nadler	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Neal	Wyden
Gephardt	Oberstar	Wynn
Geran	Obey	Yates

NOT VOTING—3

Franks (NJ)	Reynolds	Souder
-------------	----------	--------

□ 2307

So the motion to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. HEFNER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HEFNER. My parliamentary inquiry is I did not ever get the ruling of the Parliamentarian, and my parliamentary inquiry is in the future if we have the ruling of the Chair questioned or challenged, is it going to become the practice for someone to move to table the motion and we will never have a ruling on the ruling of the Chair as it applies to House rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair will respond to the gentleman by saying first that it was not the Parliamentarian's ruling, and the Chair ruled and the House just addressed the issue of that ruling.

Mr. HEFNER. Further parliamentary inquiry, and I feel this is justifiable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. HEFNER. If there is no mechanism, if there is going to be no mechanism to challenge a ruling of the Chair, if it can be superceded by a motion to table, then the majority is going to rule, there will be no chance to challenge the ruling of the Chair.

□ 2310

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DREIER). The Chair wishes to first respond to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from North Carolina by stating that the House has just ruled by a vote.

The gentleman from California is recognized for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House, are there procedural motions available to the body, and if moved, voted on, and is the motion to table a procedural motion utilized by the former majority over and over and over again?

(The letters referred to by Mr. MORAN follow:)

U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC, April 3, 1995.
Hon. ZOE LOFGREN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Given my statutory responsibility (15 USC §634b(4)) to determine the impact of the taxes on small businesses and advise Congress, I have been asked to analyze the impact on small businesses of the "Contract With America Tax Reform Act of 1995" which is scheduled to come before the House of Representatives this week for consideration.

Specifically, section 6301 of H.R. 1327, the Tax Fairness and Deficit Reduction Act of 1995, creates a 50 percent capital gains exclusion for individuals but, in so doing, repeals the special small business capital gains tax incentive in the existing law (P.L. 103-66, §13113). This will have the effect of raising the taxes of future investors in qualifying, high growth, small businesses from the previous maximum rate of 14 percent to the new rate of 19.8 percent. This may be the only category of taxpayer to have its taxes raised under the capital gains provisions of the proposal. One change from the original bill added in H.R. 1327 that small businesses will appreciate is a provision which allows investors who have already purchased qualifying stock to keep the lower rate they expected under previous law.

Nevertheless, the repeal is troubling for small businesses for two reasons. First, as a matter of even-handed tax policy, it seems incongruous to raise the tax rates of those who invest in the research, plant and equipment of a high-risk, emerging growth company while rewarding non-productive speculation in real estate or the stock market with substantial tax reductions. This is particularly true where a windfall of capital gains treatment is provided to some investors for gains on property held previous to the introduction of the across-the-board proposal where such purchases were made with no expectation of a higher after-tax return.

Second, there is persuasive evidence that emerging, high-growth small businesses are the best choice for investment incentives when measured by return-per-dollar of tax expenditure. Yet historical data suggest that the across-the-board capital gains proposal will not significantly help these small businesses seeking investment dollars and repealing the special tax preference will hurt.

Our estimate is that only 10% of business finance resources currently go to small businesses and most of that is in the form of bank loans and commercial mortgages—not long term or “patient” capital that is needed to finance research and growth.

The across-the-board 50% reduction which would replace the special small business capital gains incentive will do little to improve the situation. Historical data, based on previous across-the-board capital gains treatment, indicate that about two-thirds of the capital gains benefit will flow to appreciated property, such as real estate, and only about one-third will go to corporate equity investment. Most of the corporate equity investment, however, will reward gains generated by the transfer of existing shares of stock in the market which do not result in any new productive investment for businesses. Based on this data and current levels of venture funding, we estimate that less than one percent of the across-the-board capital gains benefits will flow to venture capital that would help small emerging companies.

Our research, and research we have reviewed, indicates that growing small businesses are greatly underfunded compared to their contribution to our economy. Small businesses in general provide 54% of all jobs and 50% of total output using only 40% of total business assets. The lion's share of our economy's job growth and innovation is generated by the type of efficient, high-growth, high-tech small business that can qualify for special capital gains treatment under current law. The purposes of the incentive is to persuade “mainstream” investors to take the added risk of investing in an emerging firm. Without such an incentive, the ability of these businesses to attract equity investment may be seriously impaired.

We conclude that the repeal of the special small business capital gains incentive and the resultant increase of the effective tax

rate on qualifying small business investors will make it more difficult for these small businesses to compete in highly competitive capital markets. Since small, high growth businesses generally develop the markets and provide the jobs that help to secure our commercial leadership in the future, the repeal may have an adverse impact on our future economic growth.

I hope that this information is useful to you during the debate. I would be happy to provide any statistics or information that I have. Feel free to call me at 205-6533 or FAX at 205-6928.

Sincerely,

JERE W. GLOVER,
Chief Counsel for Advocacy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, April 5, 1995.

Hon. JAMES P. MORAN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORAN: In response to your request regarding whether the capital gains and indexing provisions of H.R. 9 would increase the tax rate on gains from eligible small business stock, the Administration submitted written testimony to the Committee on Small Business on February 22, 1995 which stated the following:

“* * * by extending the 50 percent exclusion to all capital assets, H.R. 9 will eliminate the current preference in Section 1202 for small business stock * * * and would actually increase the tax rate on certain gains from investments in eligible small businesses. The current maximum tax rate for individuals on investment in small businesses that qualify for the Section 1202 preference is 14 percent (maximum capital gain rate of 28 percent times 50 percent exclusion).¹ H.R. 9 would eliminate the 28 percent maximum tax rate on capital gains of individuals. As a result, H.R. 9 would impose a maximum tax rate of 19.8 percent (39.6 percent maximum rate times 50 percent exclusion) on investments that currently qualify for the 14 percent preferential rate under Section 1202. A 14 percent rate in a 28 percent rate environment is relatively attractive to investors in small businesses, compared to a flat rate on all gains.”

The Administration remains committed to this positions. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions on this or any other matter.

Sincerely,

LESLIE B. SAMUELS,
Assistant Secretary (Tax Policy).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 188, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 295]

AYES—246

Allard	Baker (LA)	Bass
Andrews	Ballenger	Bateman
Archer	Barr	Bereuter
Armey	Barrett (NE)	Bevill
Bachus	Bartlett	Bilbray
Baker (CA)	Barton	Bilirakis

Bliley	Goodlatte	Ney
Boehlert	Goodling	Norwood
Boehner	Gordon	Nussle
Bonilla	Goss	Oxley
Bono	Graham	Packard
Brewster	Greenwood	Pallone
Browder	Gunderson	Parker
Brownback	Gutknecht	Paxon
Bryant (TN)	Hall (TX)	Petri
Bunn	Hancock	Pombo
Bunning	Hansen	Portman
Burr	Hastert	Pryce
Burton	Hastings (WA)	Quillen
Buyer	Hayes	Quinn
Callahan	Hayworth	Radanovich
Calvert	Hefley	Ramstad
Camp	Heineman	Regula
Canady	Herger	Riggs
Castle	Hilleary	Roberts
Chabot	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Chambliss	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Chenoweth	Hoke	Rose
Christensen	Horn	Roth
Chrysler	Hostettler	Roukema
Clement	Hunter	Royce
Clinger	Hutchinson	Salmon
Coble	Hyde	Sanford
Coburn	Inglis	Saxton
Collins (GA)	Istook	Scarborough
Combest	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer
Condit	Johnson, Sam	Seastrand
Cooley	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Kasich	Shadegg
Cramer	Kelly	Shaw
Crane	Kim	Shays
Crapo	King	Shuster
Cremeans	Kingston	Skeen
Cubin	Knollenberg	Skelton
Cunningham	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Danner	Largent	Smith (NJ)
Deal	Latham	Smith (TX)
DeLay	LaTourette	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart	Laughlin	Solomon
Dickey	Lazio	Souder
Doolittle	Leach	Spence
Dornan	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Dreier	Lewis (KY)	Stockman
Duncan	Lightfoot	Stump
Dunn	Lincoln	Talent
Ehlers	Linder	Tanner
Ehrlich	Lipinski	Tate
Emerson	Livingston	Tauzin
English	LoBiondo	Taylor (NC)
Ensign	Longley	Thomas
Everett	Lucas	Thornberry
Ewing	Manton	Tiahrt
Fawell	Manzullo	Torkildsen
Fields (TX)	Martini	Torricelli
Flanagan	McCollum	Trafficant
Foley	McCrery	Upton
Forbes	McDade	Uvanovich
Fowler	McHugh	Waldholtz
Fox	McInnis	Walker
Franks (CT)	McIntosh	Walsh
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Metcalf	Watts (OK)
Frisa	Meyers	Weldon (FL)
Funderburk	Mica	Weldon (PA)
Gallegly	Miller (FL)	Weller
Ganske	Molinari	White
Gekas	Montgomery	Whitfield
Geren	Moorhead	Wicker
Gilchrest	Myers	Wilson
Gillmor	Myrick	Young (FL)
Gilman	Nethercutt	Zeliff
Gingrich	Neumann	Zimmer

NOES—188

Abercrombie	Clay	Durbin
Ackerman	Clayton	Edwards
Baessler	Clyburn	Engel
Baldacci	Coleman	Eshoo
Barcia	Collins (IL)	Evans
Barrett (WI)	Collins (MI)	Farr
Becerra	Conyers	Fattah
Beilenson	Costello	Fazio
Bentsen	Coyne	Fields (LA)
Berman	Davis	Filner
Bishop	de la Garza	Flake
Blute	DeFazio	Foglietta
Bonior	DeLauro	Ford
Borski	Dellums	Frank (MA)
Boucher	Deutsch	Frost
Brown (CA)	Dicks	Furse
Brown (FL)	Dingell	Gejdenson
Brown (OH)	Dixon	Gephardt
Bryant (TX)	Doggett	Gibbons
Cardin	Dooley	Gonzalez
Chapman	Doyle	Green

¹Because one-half of the excluded gain is treated as a preference for AMT purposes, the actual rate could be higher for certain taxpayers subject to the AMT, but would never exceed 21 percent.

Gutierrez	McKinney	Sabo
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Sanders
Hamilton	Meehan	Sawyer
Harman	Meek	Schiff
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Schroeder
Hefner	Mfume	Schumer
Hilliard	Miller (CA)	Scott
Hinchey	Mineta	Serrano
Holden	Minge	Sisisky
Houghton	Mink	Skaggs
Hoyer	Moakley	Slaughter
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Spratt
Jacobs	Moran	Stark
Jefferson	Morella	Stenholm
Johnson (SD)	Murtha	Stokes
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Studds
Johnston	Neal	Stupak
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Kaptur	Obey	Tejeda
Kennedy (MA)	Oliver	Thompson
Kennedy (RI)	Ortiz	Thornton
Kennelly	Orton	Thurman
Kildee	Owens	Torres
Klecza	Pastor	Towns
Klink	Payne (NJ)	Tucker
Klug	Payne (VA)	Velazquez
LaFalce	Pelosi	Vento
LaHood	Peterson (FL)	Visclosky
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Volkmer
Levin	Pickett	Ward
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy	Waters
Lofgren	Porter	Watt (NC)
Lowe	Poshard	Waxman
Luther	Rahall	Williams
Maloney	Rangel	Wise
Markey	Reed	Wolf
Martinez	Richardson	Woolsey
Mascara	Rivers	Wyden
Matsui	Roemer	Wynn
McCarthy	Rogers	Yates
McDermott	Roybal-Allard	Young (AK)
McHale	Rush	

NOT VOTING—

Reynolds

□ 2326

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 889, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCIS- SIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 889) making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-101)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 889) "making emergency supplemental appropriations and rescissions to preserve and enhance the military readiness of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4,6,7,8,10, 20, 22, and 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 16 and 23, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to provide emergency supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense to preserve and enhance military readiness for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

CHAPTER I

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL
APPROPRIATIONS

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Army," \$260,700,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Navy," \$183,100,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Marine Corps," \$25,200,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Military Personnel, Air Force," \$207,100,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Army," \$6,500,000: That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Navy," \$9,600,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps," \$1,300,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Reserve Personnel, Air Force," \$2,800,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Army," \$11,000,000: That such amount is designated by Congress as an emer-

gency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "National Guard Personnel, Air Force," \$5,000,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Army," \$936,600,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy," \$423,700,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps," \$33,500,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Air Force," \$852,500,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide," \$46,200,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY RESERVE

For an additional amount for "Operation and Maintenance, Navy Reserve," \$15,400,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

PROCUREMENT

OTHER PROCUREMENT, ARMY

For an additional amount for "Other Procurement, Army," \$8,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
PROGRAMS

DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Defense Health Program," \$13,200,000: Provided, That such amount is designated by Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.